Adaptive CSMA under the SINR Model: Efficient Approximation Algorithms for Throughput and Utility Maximization

Peruru Subrahmanya Swamy, Radha Krishna Ganti, Krishna Jagannathan

arXiv:1601.06065v1 [cs.IT] 22 Jan 2016

***Abstract*—We consider a CSMA based scheduling algorithm for a single-hop wireless network under a realistic SINR model for the interference. We propose two local optimization based approximation algorithms to efficiently estimate certain attempt rate parameters of CSMA called fugacities. It is known that adaptive CSMA can achieve throughput optimality by sampling feasible schedules from a Gibbs distribution, with appropriate fugacities. Unfortunately, obtaining these optimal fugacities is an NP-hard problem. Further, the existing adaptive CSMA algorithms use a stochastic gradient descent based method, which usually entails an impractically slow (exponential in the size of the network) convergence to the optimal fugacities. To address this issue, we first propose an algorithm to estimate the fugacities, that can support a given set of desired service rates. The convergence rate and the complexity of this algorithm are independent of the network size, and depend only on the neighborhood size of a link. Further, we show that the proposed algorithm corresponds exactly to performing the well-known Bethe approximation to the underlying Gibbs distribution. Then, we propose another local algorithm to estimate the optimal fugacities under a utility maximization framework, and characterize its accuracy. Numerical results indicate that the proposed methods have a good degree of accuracy, and achieve extremely fast convergence to near-optimal fugacities, and often outperform the convergence rate of the stochastic gradient descent by a few orders of magnitude.**

***Index Terms*—Wireless ad hoc network, Distributed algorithm, CSMA, Gibbs distribution, Bethe approximation, Throughput optimality**

I. Introduction

The problem of link scheduling for maximum throughput has been widely studied, particularly with emphasis on the maximum-weight scheduling framework, developed in [2], [3]. In spite of its throughput maximizing property, maximum-weight scheduling requires centralized control, and necessitates the solution of an NP-hard problem for each scheduling decision. Several works have attempted to modify the maximum-weight algorithm, so as to make it more amenable to simple, distributed implementation [4], [5], [6]. However, these greedy algorithms do not achieve full throughput.

In a series of recent papers [7], [8], [9], a class of distributed link scheduling algorithms called adaptive CSMA algorithms have been proposed and proven to be throughput optimal, *i.e.*, they can support any achievable service rate vector. The central idea behind these algorithms lies in using a reversible Markov chain to sample feasible schedules from a product form distribution called the Gibbs distribution [10]. Specifically, each link adaptively adjusts its transmission attempt rate (also known as its fugacity) in order to ensure sufficient average service rate.

In order to support a given feasible service rate vector using CSMA, the corresponding fugacities have to be computed. Unfortunately, determining the appropriate fugacities corresponding to the desired service rates is an NP-hard problem [7]. In [7], the optimal fugacities are computed as a solution to an optimization problem (here after referred to as the Gibbsian problem), using a stochastic gradient descent algorithm. Each iteration of the gradient descent requires estimating the average service rates under the current iterate of the fugacities, which in turn entails waiting for the underlying Markov chain to reach steady-state. This 'mixing time' of the underlying Markov chain could be very large (exponential in the size of the network), depending on the network load and topology [11], [12]. Therefore, the existing adaptive CSMA algorithms [7] do not provide a practical way to estimate the fugacities, although they effectively support the desired service rates once the optimal fugacities are estimated [13]. The main focus of this paper is in proposing efficient methods to estimate the fugacities, under a realistic SINR (signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio) model for the interference. Specifically, we consider the following two scenarios under which fugacities are to be computed:

- The service rate requirements of the links are known. The objective is to support these average service rates.
- The service rate requirements are not known, but each link has a utility function of its average service rate. The objective is to maximize the sum utility of the network.

A simple conflict graph based interference model [7], [8], [9] is widely used in the wireless context due to its simplicity and tractability, although it does not adequately capture the complex nature of the wireless interference [14]. More specifically, a conflict graph based interference model ignores the fact that whether or not two links can transmit simultaneously, depends on the transmission state of the other links and their spatial locations. Some recent papers extend the adaptive CSMA framework to a more realistic interference models like the SINR model [15], [16], and Rayleigh faded channels [17]. However, these papers also essentially employ stochastic gradient descent on a Gibbsian function to

A part of this work [1] has been presented at IEEE Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton) 2015, held at Monticello, IL, USA

P. S. Swamy, R. K. Ganti and K. Jagannathan are with the Department of Electrical Engineering, IIT Madras, Chennai, India 600036. Email:{p.swamy, rganti, krishnaj}@ee.iitm.ac.in

estimate the fugacities, and hence suffer from impractically slow convergence rates.

For the conflict graph based interference model assumed in [7], approximate but efficient methods to compute the fugacities have been proposed [18], [19] using a popular variational technique called the Bethe approximation [20], [21]. However, the solutions given in [18], [19], cannot be directly extended to SINR based interference model. This is because the conflict graph based interference model corresponds to a simple pairwise interaction model [20], while the SINR model involves higher order interactions. The presence of these higher order interactions makes the extension non-trivial. For graphical models even with higher order interactions, there are well known algorithms like Belief propagation (BP) [20] for solving the Bethe approximation problem. However, in the context of adaptive CSMA under the SINR model, they can directly be used only to estimate the service rates given the fugacities, but not the other way around.

We start with the Gibbsian optimization problem corresponding to the optimal fugacities, and approximate this global problem by decoupling it into local optimization problems at each link. The local problems are identical in structure to the global problem, and are referred to as the local Gibbisan problems. The dimension of the local problem at a link is equal to the size of its immediate neighbourhood and hence typically small, and independent of the network size. Therefore these local Gibbsian problems can be efficiently solved in a scalable fashion. The local solutions are then suitably combined to obtain an approximate solution to the global problem. In particular, for two special cases of the SINR based interference model, we obtain closed form solutions to these local problems.

We prove that the solution of our local Gibbs optimization method corresponds exactly to the celebrated Bethe approximation [20] to the global Gibbsian optimization problem. The accuracy of the Bethe approximation has been empirically evidenced in various fields [20], [22]. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect a fair degree of accuracy in the context of CSMA as well. In fact, numerical results indicate that in order to obtain the level of accuracy in the fugacities obtained by using our proposed method, the stochastic gradient descent method [7] takes an inordinately long time, often running into tens of millions of time units even for fairly small networks. Therefore, in practical terms, our algorithm will operate with substantially smaller convergence time, compared to the original implementation of adaptive CSMA.

It is worth noting that our algorithm is robust to gradual changes in the desired service rates, as well as to changes in the network topology, since the local solutions can be efficiently re-computed for the new set of requirements. On the other hand, the stochastic gradient descent is likely to take a very long time to converge to its new operating point.

The impractically slow mixing time of the CSMA Markov chain is also known to result in poor delay performance [11], [12]. Recent works like [13], [23] have shown improved delay performance by employing several parallel instances of this Markov chain. However, the result in [13] assumes that the required optimal fugacities can be pre-computed and given to their algorithm. Our local algorithms which efficiently estimate these fugacities can be used in conjunction with the techniques in [13], [23] to obtain a practical CSMA algorithm with good throughput and delay properties.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we describe the SINR based interference model, and review the adaptive CSMA algorithm. In Section III, we introduce the local Gibbsian problems and propose our algorithm for computing the fugacities for a given service rate requirements. Section IV provides a brief review of the Bethe approximation, as relevant to adaptive CSMA. In Section V, we derive our main result which establishes the equivalence between the local Gibbs optimization, and the Bethe approximation. In Section VI, we consider two special cases of the SINR model and derive closed-form expressions for the local Gibbsian problems. In Section VII, we propose a local algorithm to solve the utility maximization problem and quantify its performance. In Section VIII, we present numerical results to confirm the fast convergence, and Section IX concludes the paper.

II. Model and Preliminaries

We consider a single-hop wireless network and model the links using a bipole model, introduced in [24], [25]. In a bipole model, each transmitter is associated with a receiver on the Euclidean plane. A transmitter and its corresponding receiver are referred to as a link. Let $\mathcal{N}$ denote the set of all the links in the network. Let $|\mathcal{N}| = N$ be the total number of links. Let r_{ii} denote the distance between the transmitter and receiver of link i. For simplicity, we assume[1] that a link distance r_{ii} is much smaller than the distances of the transmitter and the receiver from the other links. With this assumption, we can think of links as points in the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^2$. Let r_{ji} denote the distance between the links i, j. We assume a time slotted model.

Interference model: We consider the standard path-loss model $\|d\|^{-\alpha}, \alpha > 2$, where d is the distance between a receiver and a transmitter, and α is the path loss exponent. Let P_i denote the transmit power of link i. We assume white Gaussian thermal noise at all the receivers with variance w. Let $\mathbf{x}(t) = [x_i]_{i=1}^N$ denote the schedule of the network at time t. Specifically, $x_i(t) = 1$ denotes that the link i is active (transmitting) in time slot t. If there is no ambiguity, we will also use $\mathbf{x}$ to denote $\mathbf{x}(t)$.

Although all the active links in the network can potentially contribute to the interference, the aggregate interference from the transmitters beyond a certain distance can be safely neglected [26], [27]. This approximation is standard in the literature [15] and this distance, referred to as the *close-in* radius is denoted by R_I. Let $\mathcal{N}_i := \{k \mid r_{ik} \leq R_I\}$. For convenience, let link i be also included in the set $\mathcal{N}_i$. We refer to the links in $\mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{i\}$ as the neighbors of link i. The neighborhood relationship can be represented by an *interference graph* $G(V, E)$. V is the set of links in the network and two links share an edge if they are within a

[1]The results in this paper do not require this assumption. This is just to keep the expressions concise.

distance R_I. Then the total interference power at link i is given by

$$I_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \mid j \neq i,\ x_j = 1\}} P_j r_{ji}^{-\alpha}. \tag{1}$$

Then, the SINR at link i is given by

$$\gamma_i(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{P_i r_{ii}^{-\alpha}}{I_i(\mathbf{x}) + w}. \tag{2}$$

Reception model: We assume that, in each time slot, a single packet of data is transmitted from each active transmitter. If the received SINR at the corresponding receiver exceeds a pre-determined threshold T, *i.e.,* $\gamma_i(\mathbf{x}) \geq T$, the packet is successfully received.

Rate region: A schedule $\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathcal{N}}$ is said to be *feasible*, if all the active links in the schedule meet the required SINR constraint, *i.e.,* $\gamma_i(\mathbf{x}) \geq T,\ \forall i$ such that $x_i = 1$. The set of all the feasible schedules is denoted by $\mathcal{I}$. In our scenario, since each link transmits one data packet whenever it is successful, the long-term service rate of a link is equal to the fraction of time the link is successful. The *rate region* Λ, which is defined as the set of all the possible service rates is given by the convex hull of the feasible schedules in $\mathcal{I}$. Hence, $\Lambda = \{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{x} \mid \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\mathbf{x}} = 1,\ \alpha_{\mathbf{x}} \geq 0,\ \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I}\}$. If a link scheduling policy can support any rate vector in the rate region, then the scheduling policy is said to be *rate-optimal*.

Adaptive CSMA: We briefly review the adaptive CSMA algorithm [7], [16]. In this algorithm, each link i is associated with a fugacity $\lambda_i > 0$ which defines the underlying Gibbs distribution. In each time slot, a randomly selected link i is allowed to update its schedule $x_i(t)$ based on the information in the previous slot:

- If its SINR is inadequate, *i.e.,* $\gamma_i(\mathbf{x}(t-1)) \leq T$, then $x_i(t) = 0$.
- If $\gamma_i(\mathbf{x}(t-1)) \geq T$, then link i exchanges control messages with its neighbors, to find if they can meet their SINR requirements if link i gets activated. If any of its neighbors cannot meet its requirement, then $x_i(t) = 0$.
- If all the neighbors can meet their SINR requirements even if link i gets activated, then $x_i(t) = 1$ with probability $\frac{\lambda_i}{1+\lambda_i}$, and $x_i(t) = 0$ with probability $\frac{1}{1+\lambda_i}$.

It can be shown that the algorithm induces a Markov chain on the state space of the schedules $\{0,1\}^{\mathcal{N}}$. Further, the stationary distribution of the Markov chain, parametrized by the fugacity vector $\lambda = [\lambda_i]_{i=1}^N$, is given by

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{j\,:\,x_j=1} \lambda_j\ \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I}), \qquad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^N, \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I})$ is an indicator of $\mathbf{x}$ being a feasible schedule, and Z is the normalizing constant. Then, due to the ergodicity of the Markov chain, the long-term service rate of a link i denoted by s_i is equal to the marginal probability that link i is active, *i.e.,* $p_i(x_i = 1)$. Thus, the service rates and the fugacities are related as follows:

$$s_i = p_i(1) = \sum_{\mathbf{x}\,:\,x_i=1} Z^{-1} \prod_{j\,:\,x_j=1} \lambda_j,\ \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{4}$$

where $p_i(1)$ denotes $p_i(x_i = 1)$. The adaptive CSMA algorithm can support any service rate in the rate region provided appropriate fugacities are used [7], [15] for the underlying Gibbs distribution.

If the desired service rates are known, these fugacities can be obtained by solving the system of equations in (4). Equivalently, the fugacities can also be obtained by solving the following Gibbsian optimization problem [7] referred to as the global problem.

The global Gibbsian problem:

$$\ln \lambda = \arg\max_{r \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}} G(r), \tag{5}$$
$$\text{where } G(r) := \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} s_k r_k - \ln\Big(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{I}} \exp\Big(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}} y_k r_k\Big)\Big).$$

Here $\{s_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \in \Lambda$ are the desired service rates. A distributed stochastic gradient descent algorithm was proposed in [7] to solve (5). However, estimating the gradient of $G(r)$ in a distributed manner entails the underlying Markov chain of the CSMA algorithm to converge to steady-state, which takes an impractically long time in general.

In the next section, we consider this scenario where the links know their target service rates. We provide an efficient and scalable approximation to this problem, by proposing the following local Gibbsian problems. The solutions of these local problems are appropriately combined to estimate the solution to the global problem.

III. The local Gibbsian problems

We now introduce some definitions required for the description of the local Gibbsian problems.

Local schedule: Let $\mathbf{x}_j \in \{0,1\}^{\mathcal{N}_j}$, be the set of variables corresponding to the transmission status of the link j and its neighbors, *i.e.,* $\mathbf{x}_j := \{x_k \mid k \in \mathcal{N}_j\}$. We refer to $\mathbf{x}_j$ as the *local schedule* at j. Further, from (1), it can be observed that the SINR of a link depends only on the local schedule. Hence the SINR at a link j can be viewed as a function of $\mathbf{x}_j$, *i.e.,* $\gamma_j(\mathbf{x}) = \gamma_j(\mathbf{x}_j)$. Also, recall that a schedule $\mathbf{x}$ is said to be feasible, if all the active links in the schedule meet their required SINR threshold. Thus, $\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I})$ can be factorized over the local schedule variables $\{\mathbf{x}_j\}_{j=1}^N$ as $\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I}) = \prod_{j\,:\,x_j=1} \mathbf{1}(\gamma_j(\mathbf{x}_j) \geq T)$. Then, (3) can be written as

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{j\,:\,x_j=1} \lambda_j \mathbf{1}(\gamma_j(\mathbf{x}_j) \geq T), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^N. \tag{6}$$

Local feasiblity: A local schedule $y = [y_k]_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathcal{N}_j}$ at link j is said to be *feasible*, if either the link j is inactive (*i.e.,* $y_j = 0$), or it is active and meets the required threshold SINR *i.e.,* ($y_j = 1$ and $\mathbf{1}(\gamma_j(y) \geq T)$). The set of all the feasible local schedules at j is denoted by $\mathcal{I}_j$. It can be observed from (6) that $p(\mathbf{x})$ assigns zero probability to a schedule $\mathbf{x}$ if any of its local schedule is infeasible.

Local service rate vector: Let $\mathbf{s} := \{s_i\}_{i=1}^N$ denote the set of service rates of all the links in the network. Then the local service rate vector at link j denoted by $\mathbf{s}_j$ be defined as the

set of all the service rates corresponding to the link j and its neighbors, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{s}_j := \{s_k \mid k \in \mathcal{N}_j\}$.

Local capacity region: The local capacity region at link j is defined as the convex hull of the local feasible schedules at link j given by

$$\Lambda_j = \{\sum_{z\in\mathcal{I}_j} \alpha_z z \mid \sum_{z\in\mathcal{I}_j} \alpha_z = 1,\ \alpha_z \geq 0,\ z \in \mathcal{I}_j\}. \quad (7)$$

The local Gibbsian problem at link j :

$$\beta_j = \arg\max_{r\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}_j}} F(r), \quad (8)$$

where $\beta_j := [\beta_{jk}]_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j}$, and the function $F : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}_j} \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$F(r) := \sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} s_k r_k - \ln\Big(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{I}_j} \exp\Big(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} y_k r_k\Big)\Big).$$

Observe that, the local problems are structurally similar to the global problem, except that $\mathcal{I}$ in the global problem is replaced by $\mathcal{I}_j$, and $\mathcal{N}$ is replaced by $\mathcal{N}_j$. In particular, the dimension of the local problem at link i is just $|\mathcal{N}_i|$. The solutions to these local problems are referred to as the *local fugacities*. In particular, at each link $j \in \mathcal{N}$, there is a local fugacity vector $\beta_j := [\beta_{jk}]_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j}$.

Local algorithm: Here, we propose a simple and distributed algorithm to solve the local Gibbsian problems and subsequently compute the approximate global fugacities by combining the local solutions using (9). These approximate global fugacities can be directly used in the CSMA algorithm instead of adapting the fugacties using a stochastic gradient descent on the global problem which usually doesn't converge in practical time scales. Each link in the network executes the following algorithm in parallel.

Local Gibbsian method at link j

Input: (s_k, $k \in \mathcal{N}_j$); *Output:* $\tilde{\lambda}_j$.

1) Obtain the service rates (s_k, $k \in \mathcal{N}_j$) from the neighbours.
2) Compute the local fugacities (β_{jk}, $k \in \mathcal{N}_j$) by solving the local problem (8) using the Newton's method [28].
3) Obtain the following local fugacities (β_{kj}, $k \in \mathcal{N}_j$) from the neighbours.
4) Compute the approximate global fugacity $\tilde{\lambda}_j$ as

$$\tilde{\lambda}_j = \left(\frac{1-s_j}{s_j}\right)^{|\mathcal{N}_j|-1} \prod_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} e^{\beta_{kj}}. \quad (9)$$

Information exchange: On the whole, the algorithm requires only two steps of information exchange with the neighbours. Once in the first step, to obtain the service requirements of the neighbours, and again in the third step to obtain the local fugacities computed at the neighbours. Except for these two information exchanges, the algorithm is fully distributed and can be executed independently at each link. Also, it may be noted that a link requires only one element of the fugacity vector computed at each neighbour, but not the entire fugacity vector. For example, link j obtains β_{kj} (which is only one element of the local fugacity vector at link k) from the neighboring link k.

Computational complexity: The implementation of the Newton's method [28] in the second step of our algorithm is feasible. This is because the gradient and the Hessian of the local objective function $F(r)$ can be analytically computed since the dimension of the problem is small. The exact expressions for the gradient and Hessian at link j can be computed using certain marginals of the distribution $\hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j) = Z_j^{-1}\exp(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} x_k r_k), \forall \mathbf{x}_j \in \mathcal{I}_j$, where Z_j is a normalization constant.

For $k \in \mathcal{N}_j$, let $m_k(r)$ represent the probability $\mathbb{P}(x_k = 1)$ under the distribution $\hat{b}_j$. Similarly, for $i, k \in \mathcal{N}_j$, let m_{ik} denote the probability $\mathbb{P}(x_i = 1, x_k = 1)$ under the same distribution $\hat{b}_j$. Then, the gradient and Hessian of the function $F(r)$ are given by

$$[\nabla(F(r))]_k = s_k - m_k(r),\ \ k \in \mathcal{N}_j,$$

$$[\nabla^2(F(r))]_{ik} = \begin{cases} m_{ik}(r) - m_i(r)m_k(r), & i,k \in \mathcal{N}_j, i \neq k \\ m_k(r) - m_k(r)^2, & i = k. \end{cases}$$

The computation of the gradient and the Hessian requires the information about the local feasible schedules at a link. Specifically, this information is required to compute the normalization constant Z_j. These computations are feasible because the $O(2^{|\mathcal{N}_j|})$ complexity involved in this computation scales only with the size of the local neighborhood, and is independent of the total size of the network which could be substantially large. In particular, in spatial networks where the neighborhood size does not scale with the network size, our algorithm is order optimal, while the converge rate of the global stochastic gradient descent typically scales as $O(2^N)$. Further, it can be easily shown that the objective function of the local problem, $F(r)$ in (8) is a strictly concave function which guarantees an extremely fast convergence rate for the Newton's method. Indeed, as the numerical results indicate, the local algorithm converges in three to four time steps under most scenarios.

Next, we prove that the approximate global fugacites $\{\tilde{\lambda}_j\}_{j=1}^N$ obtained using the local Gibbsian method (9) correspond exactly to performing the well known Bethe approximation to the global Gibbsian problem. In the next section, we review the Bethe approximation technique.

IV. Review of the Bethe approximation

A. Product form distribution

Let S be a finite set, and let $X_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, be random variables each taking values in S. The joint PMF (probability mass function) of the random variables is succinctly denoted as $p(\mathbf{x})$, where $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N\}$. Suppose that $p(\mathbf{x})$ factors into a product of M functions and is given by,

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{j=1}^{M} f_j(\mathbf{x}_j), \qquad \mathbf{x} \in S^N. \quad (10)$$

The function $f_j(\cdot)$ has arguments $\mathbf{x}_j$ that are some non-empty subset of $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N\}$. Here Z is a normalization constant. Further, the product form distributions are generally

represented using a graph called factor graph [20] that has two sets of nodes namely variable nodes and factor nodes corresponding to the variables and the functions in (10) respectively. An edge is drawn between a variable node and a factor node if the variable is an argument of that factor function. For the product form distribution considered in (10), we are interested in the marginal probabilities called variable marginals and factor marginals.

Variable node marginals: The marginal probability distribution $p_i(x_i)$ corresponding to a variable node i, is obtained by summing $p(\mathbf{x})$ over the variables corresponding to all other variable nodes, *i.e.*, $p_i(x_i) = \sum_{\mathbf{x}\setminus x_i} p(\mathbf{x})$, $x_i \in S$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

Factor node marginals: Corresponding to each factor node, $j = 1, \ldots, M$, the marginal probability function $\hat{p}_j(\mathbf{x}_j)$, is obtained by summing $p(\mathbf{x})$ over all the variables in $\mathbf{x} \setminus \mathbf{x}_j$. Let N_j denote the number of arguments in f_j, *i.e.*, $N_j = |\mathbf{x}_j|$. Then, $\hat{p}_j(\mathbf{x}_j) = \sum_{\mathbf{x}\setminus\mathbf{x}_j} p(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{x}_j \in S^{N_j}$.

Let $\mathbf{p}_v := \{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$, $\mathbf{p}_f := \{\hat{p}_j\}_{j=1}^M$ denote the collection of all the variable node marginals and the factor node marginals corresponding to the distribution $p(\mathbf{x})$ respectively. Next, we discuss the Bethe approximation [20] which is used to estimate these marginal probability distributions.

B. Bethe approximation

1) Bethe free energy (BFE): Consider a probability distribution $p(\mathbf{x})$ of the form (10) for which we are interested in finding the marginals. Let $b(\mathbf{x})$ be some distribution on S^N, whose factor and variable marginals are given by $\mathbf{b}_f = \{\hat{b}_j\}_{j=1}^M$ and $\mathbf{b}_v = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^N$. Here, $p(\mathbf{x})$ is referred to as the *true* distribution, and $b(\mathbf{x})$ is referred to as the *trial* distribution as it is used to estimate the true distribution $p(\mathbf{x})$. Next, we define the Bethe entropy, which is required for the definition of BFE. The Bethe entropy of a distribution $b(\mathbf{x})$ is a weighted sum of the entropies corresponding to the factor and the variable marginal distributions of $b(\mathbf{x})$ and is given by $H_B(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v) = \sum_{j=1}^M \hat{H}_j(\hat{b}_j) - \sum_{i=1}^N (d_i - 1) H_i(b_i)$, where d_i is the degree of the variable node i in the factor graph, and $\hat{H}_j(\hat{b}_j) = -\sum_{y \in S^{N_j}} \hat{b}_j(y) \ln \hat{b}_j(y)$, $H_i(b_i) = -\sum_{y \in S} b_i(y) \ln b_i(y)$ denote the entropies of the factor marginal $\hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j)$, and the variable marginal $b_i(x_i)$ respectively.

Definition 1. *Consider a true distribution $p(\mathbf{x})$ of the form* (10)*. Let $b(\mathbf{x})$ be a trial distribution. Then, the Bethe free energy $F_B(b)$ is defined as*

$$F_B(b) = F_B(\boldsymbol{b}_f, \boldsymbol{b}_v) = U_B(\boldsymbol{b}_f, \boldsymbol{b}_v) - H_B(\boldsymbol{b}_f, \boldsymbol{b}_v), \quad (11)$$

where $U_B(\boldsymbol{b}_f, \boldsymbol{b}_v) = -\sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}_j} \hat{b}(\mathbf{x}_j) \ln f_j(\mathbf{x}_j)$.

2) Bethe optimization (BO): The following optimization problem is referred to as the Bethe optimization.

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v}{\arg\min}\ & F_B(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v), \text{ subject to} \quad (12)\\ & b_i(x_i) \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N, \ \ x_i \in S,\\ & \sum_{x_i} b_i(x_i) = 1, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N,\\ & \hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j) \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, M, \ \ \mathbf{x}_j \in S^{N_j},\\ & \sum_{\mathbf{x}_j} \hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j) = 1, \quad j = 1, \ldots, M,\\ & \sum_{\mathbf{x}_j \setminus \{x_i\}} \hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j) = b_i(x_i), \ \ j = 1, \ldots, M, \ i \in \mathcal{N}_j, \ x_i \in S, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_j$ is the set of indices of all the variable nodes associated with the factor node j.

Note: A feasible collection $(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v)$ of the Bethe optimization problem does not necessarily represent the marginals of any coherent joint distribution over S^N, and are therefore referred to as *pseudo-marginals* [20]. In spite of performing the optimization over a relaxed set, the solution of the Bethe optimization $(\mathbf{b}_f^*, \mathbf{b}_v^*)$ exactly coincides with the marginals of the true distribution $(\mathbf{p}_f^*, \mathbf{p}_v^*)$, if the underlying factor graph is a tree. Further, for factor graphs with loops, the solution leads to very good estimates of the true marginals [20], [22]. In fact, in many applications, solving for the global minimizer of (12) is not feasible because of its non-convexity. Hence, a stationary point of the BFE satisfying the constraints in (12) is considered as a good estimate of the true marginals [20].

C. Bethe approximation for CSMA

We observe that the stationary distribution of the CSMA Markov chain $p(\mathbf{x})$ given by (6) is in product from (10) with the factor functions $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^N$ defined as

$$f_j(\mathbf{x}_j) = \begin{cases} \lambda_j, & \text{if } x_j = 1, \gamma_j(\mathbf{x}_j) \geq T, \\ 0, & \text{if } x_j = 1, \gamma_j(\mathbf{x}_j) < T, \\ 1, & \text{if } x_j = 0. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_j$ is the local schedule of the link j defined earlier.

By the definition of local feasibility, $p(\mathbf{x})$ assigns zero probability to a schedule $\mathbf{x}$, if it is locally infeasible at any link. Hence, the factor node marginals $\mathbf{p}_f = \{\hat{p}_j\}_{j=1}^N$ have to satisfy $\hat{p}_j(y) = 0, \quad \forall y \notin \mathcal{I}_j, \ \forall j \in \mathcal{N}$.

BFE for CSMA: We shall consider the product form representation of the CSMA stationary distribution $p(\mathbf{x})$ in (6) and compute the BFE. As defined in (11), the BFE for a given trial distribution $b(\mathbf{x})$ has two terms $U_B(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v)$, $H_B(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v)$. The following lemma characterizes the first term $U_B(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v)$.

Lemma 1. *If the factor marginals of a trial distribution $\boldsymbol{b}_f$, assign zero probabilities to all the infeasible local schedules,* i.e.,

$$\hat{b}_j(y) = 0, \ \forall y \notin \mathcal{I}_j, \ \forall j \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (14)$$

then $U_B(\boldsymbol{b}_f, \boldsymbol{b}_v)$ reduces to $U_B(\boldsymbol{b}_f, \boldsymbol{b}_v) = U_B(\boldsymbol{b}_v) = -\sum_{i=1}^N b_i(1) \ln \lambda_i$. Moreover, if $\boldsymbol{b}_f$ does not satisfy (14)*, $U_B(\boldsymbol{b}_f, \boldsymbol{b}_v) = \infty$.*

Proof: Proof follows from definition of factors in (13). ■

Using Lemma 1 and (11), the BFE for any $(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v)$ that satisfies (14) is given by

$$F_B(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v) = F_B\left(\{\hat{b}_j\}_{j=1}^N, \{b_i\}_{i=1}^N\right), \tag{15}$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{N} -b_i(1)\ln\lambda_i - \hat{H}_i(\hat{b}_i) + (d_i - 1)H_i(b_i),$$

where d_i is degree of variable node i in the factor graph. For $(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v)$ that does not satisfy (14), $F_B(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v) = \infty$.

V. Local Gibbs Optimization gives the Bethe approximated fugacities

We are now in a position to state a key result of this paper, which asserts that the approximated global fugacities obtained by solving the local Gibbsian problems correspond exactly to the Bethe approximated fugacities for the global problem. Specifically, we claim that $\{\tilde{\lambda}\}_{i=1}^N$ obtained through (9), are the unique set of fugacities for which, the desired service rates $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are obtained as a stationary point of the corresponding Bethe free energy. The precise statement is as follows:

Theorem 1. *Let $\{\tilde{\lambda}\}_{i=1}^N$ be the approximate fugacities estimated in* (9)*. Then these are the unique fugacities for which the marginals given in* (17) *and* (18) *are obtained as a stationary point of the corresponding Bethe free energy given in* (16)*.*

$$F_B(\boldsymbol{b}_f, \boldsymbol{b}_v) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} -b_i(1)\ln\tilde{\lambda}_i - \hat{H}_i(\hat{b}_i) + (d_i - 1)H_i(b_i), \tag{16}$$

$$b_j^*(1) = s_j,\ b_j^*(0) = 1 - s_j, \tag{17}$$

$$\hat{b}_j^*(\boldsymbol{x}_j) = \frac{1}{Z_j}\exp\Big(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} x_k\beta_{jk}\Big),\ \ \forall \boldsymbol{x}_j \in \mathcal{I}_j, \tag{18}$$

where β_j is the local fugacity vector at link j obtained from (8)*, and Z_j is the corresponding normalization constant.*

Proof: First, we establish that $(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v)$ is a stationary point of the Bethe free energy if and only if it satisfies the conditions given in Lemmas 2 and 4. To that end, we prove these two Lemmas separately, and in Appendix X-B, we argue that these two Lemmas together constitute the necessary and sufficient condition.

Next, we prove that the factor and variable marginals in (17), (18) satisfy the conditions specified in Lemmas 2 and 4.

The following lemma states that a gradient zero point of $F_B(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v)$ should have a maximal entropy property, subject to constraints defined in (12), and (14).

Lemma 2. *Let $(\boldsymbol{b}_f^*, \boldsymbol{b}_v^*)$ be a stationary point of the BFE corresponding to the distribution $p(\boldsymbol{x})$ in* (6)*. Then, for each $j \in \mathcal{N}$, this factor marginal $\hat{b}_j^*$ is related to its corresponding variable marginals $\{b_i^*\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j}$, through the following constrained entropy maximization problem, parameterized by the variable marginals $\{b_i^*\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j}$:*

$$\hat{b}_j^* = \arg\max_{\hat{b}_j} \hat{H}_j(\hat{b}_j),\ \textit{subject to}, \tag{19}$$

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}_j\setminus\{x_i\}} \hat{b}_j(\boldsymbol{x}_j) = b_i^*(x_i), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}_j,\ x_i = 1, \tag{20}$$

$$\hat{b}_j(y) = 0, \quad \forall y \notin \mathcal{I}_j. \tag{21}$$

Proof: Proof is provided in Appendix X-A. ■

Further, it can be shown [29] that there is a unique solution to the maximum entropy problem (19). In other words, the variable marginals $\{b_i^*\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j}$ uniquely characterize the factor marginal $\hat{b}_j^*$. This unique characterization is stated in the following Lemma.

Lemma 3. *The optimal solution of* (19) *will have the following form, parametrized by $v_j := [v_{jk}]_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}_j|}$.*

$$\hat{b}_j^*(\boldsymbol{x}_j) = \frac{1}{Z_j}\exp\Big(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} x_k v_{jk}\Big), \qquad \forall \mathbf{x}_j \in \mathcal{I}_j, \tag{22}$$

where Z_j is a normalization constant, and v_j is the solution to the following optimization problem defined by the variable marginals $\{b_i^*\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}_j}$:

$$v_j = \arg\max_{r\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}_j}} F(r), \tag{23}$$

where $F(r) := \sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} b_k^*(1)r_k - \ln\Big(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{I}_j}\exp\Big(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} y_k r_k\Big)\Big)$.

Proof: Proof follows by considering the dual problem of (19), by associating dual variables with the constraints in (20). It is a standard proof which can be found in [29]. ■

Note that the optimization problem (23) corresponds exactly to the local Gibbsian optimization problem (8). Hence in the light of Lemma 3, it is straight forward to verify that the variable and factor marginals defined in (17), (18) satisfy the condition laid in Lemma 2. Next, in Lemma 4, we derive the second condition required for stationary point of $F_B(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v)$.

Lemma 4. *Let $(\boldsymbol{b}_f^*, \boldsymbol{b}_v^*)$ be a stationary point of the BFE corresponding to the distribution $p(\boldsymbol{x})$ in* (6)*. For each $i \in \mathcal{N}$, let v_i be the vector which characterizes the factor marginal $\hat{b}_i^*$. Then the global fugacities which define $p(\boldsymbol{x})$ are related to the factor and variables marginals $(\boldsymbol{b}_f^*, \boldsymbol{b}_v^*)$ as follows:*

$$\lambda_i = \left(\frac{1 - b_i^*(1)}{b_i^*(1)}\right)^{d_i - 1} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} e^{v_{ji}},\ \ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{24}$$

Proof: Proof is provided in Appendix X-B. ■

Further, due to the definition of the approximated global fugacities (9), the variable and factor marginals defined in (17), (18) immediately satisfy the condition laid in Lemma 4. Hence, the conditions specified by Lemmas 2 and 4 are satisfied by $(\mathbf{b}_f^*, \mathbf{b}_v^*)$ defined in (17), (18) which proves that it is a stationary point of the BFE (16). Further, the uniqueness of the fugacities follows from the fact that the maximum entropy problem (19) has a unique solution, and (24) in Lemma 4. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1. ■

VI. Special cases

In this section, we describe two special cases of the SINR interference model called the *Conflict graph model* [9] and the *conservative SINR model* considered in [15]. For these models, we derive simple closed form expressions for the local fugacities, which are otherwise to be obtained by solving the optimization problem (8).

A. Conflict graph model

In the conflict graph model [9], two links cannot transmit simultaneously if one link is within the interference range of the other link. Then $\mathcal{I}_i$, the set of local feasible schedules at a link i, has a simple structure. Specifically, the set $\mathcal{I}_i$ has only one feasible local schedule with link i being active (*i.e.*, the local schedule with just link i being active and all the neighbors inactive). In all other feasible local schedules link i is inactive. By taking advantage of this simple structure of $\mathcal{I}_i$, the local fugacities are derived as follows.

Theorem 2. *For the conflict graph model, the local fugacities* i.e.*, solution of the local Gibbsian problem* (8) *at a link i has a closed form expression given by*

$$e^{\beta_{ij}} = \begin{cases} s_i \left(1-s_i\right)^{d_i-2} \prod\limits_{k \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{i\}} (1-s_i-s_k)^{-1}, & \text{if } j = i, \\ s_j (1-s_i-s_j)^{-1}, & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{i\}. \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

Proof: Proof is provided in Appendix X-C ■

B. Conservative SINR model

In the conservative SINR model considered in [15], the neighboring links of a link i are ranked in an ascending order based on the interference they incur to link i. Then, the set of neighboring links $\mathcal{N}_i$ is partitioned into two disjoint sets $\mathcal{N}_i^A$ and $\mathcal{N}_i^B$. The set $\mathcal{N}_i^A$ is obtained by adding the neighboring links one by one, starting from the link incurring the lowest interference to the highest, till the aggregate interference of all the links in $\mathcal{N}_i^A$ is small enough to maintain the required SINR threshold T at link i. All the neighboring links which are not in $\mathcal{N}_i^A$ are said to be intolerable and are included in the set $\mathcal{N}_i^B$. Let d_i^a, d_i^b be the sizes of the sets. Then the local fugacities can be related to the service rates as follows.

Theorem 3. *For the conservative SINR model, the local fugacities have the following closed form expressions:*

$$e^{\beta_{ij}} = \begin{cases} s_i \left(1-s_i\right)^{d_i^b-1} \prod\limits_{k \in \mathcal{N}_i^B} (1-s_i-s_k)^{-1}, & \text{if } j = i, \\ s_j (1-s_i-s_j)^{-1}, & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{N}_i^B, \\ s_j (1-s_j)^{-1}, & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{N}_i^A. \end{cases} \tag{26}$$

Proof: Proof is provided in Appendix X-D. ■

VII. Utility Maximization

In this section, we consider the utility maximization problem and provide an approximation algorithm to solve the problem in a distributed manner. The problem is defined as follows. Suppose each link i in the network is associated with a concave utility function of its service rate $U_i : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}_+$. Our objective is to find the service rates that maximize the system wide utility, *i.e.*,

$$\max_{y \in \Lambda} \sum_i U_i(y_i), \tag{27}$$

and subsequently compute the global fugacities that correspond to these optimal service rates.

In [7], an iterative algorithm to update the global fugacities is proposed. However, each iteration of the algorithm requires an underlying slowly mixing Markov chain to reach steady state. Hence it suffers from impractically slow convergence to the optimal fugacities. To address this issue, we propose an iterative algorithm which updates the local fugacities instead of directly updating the global fugacities. These local fugacitiy updates are computationally simple and do not require any Markov chain to convergence. These local fugacities are then used to obtain the approximate global fugacities using (9) proposed in Section III.

Our local algorithm can be explained as follows. Each link in the network executes this algorithm in parallel. The algorithm involves solving an one dimensional optimization problem (28) related to the original optimization problem (27). Here $\theta > 0$, is a parameter of the algorithm that can be tuned. The solution of this optimization problem $s_j(t)$ is used in the subsequent steps of the algorithm to update the local fugacities (29) and the global fugacities. We will later show that the update equation (29) is inspired by a subgradient descent algorithm for a related optimization problem. The term $\alpha(t)$ corresponds to the step-size of the subgradient descent algorithm. Any standard step-sizes that satisfy the convergence criteria for a subgradient descent method can be used [28]. A typical example is $\alpha(t) = \frac{1}{t}$.

Local algorithm for utility maximization at link j

1) At $t = 0$, initialize $\beta_{jk}(t) = 0,\ \forall k \in \mathcal{N}_j$.

   Computing global fugacities:

2) Obtain the following local fugacities $(\beta_{kj}(t),\ k \in \mathcal{N}_j)$ from the neighbours.
3) Compute $s_j(t)$ as

$$s_j(t) = \arg \max_{q \in [0,1]} \theta U_j(q) - q \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} \beta_{kj}(t). \tag{28}$$

4) Compute the approximate global fugacity $\tilde{\lambda}_j(t)$ from local fugacities $(\beta_{kj}(t),\ k \in \mathcal{N}_j)$ and $s_j(t)$ using (9).

   Updating the local fugacities:

5) Consider the distribution

$$\hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j;t) = Z_j^{-1} \exp\Big(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} x_k \beta_{jk}(t)\Big), \forall \mathbf{x}_j \in \mathcal{I}_j,$$

and for each $k \in \mathcal{N}_j$, let $m_{jk}(t) := \sum_{\mathbf{x}_j : x_k = 1} \hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j;t)$ represent the marginal probability corresponding to x_k under this distribution.

6) For each $k \in \mathcal{N}_j$, obtain $s_k(t)$ computed at the neighbour k, and update the local fugacity at j using

$$\beta_{jk}(t+1) = \beta_{jk}(t) + \alpha(t)\left(s_k(t) - m_{jk}(t)\right). \quad (29)$$

Information exchange: The required information exchange and the complexity of the algorithm in an iteration, depend only on the size of the local neighbourhood, and is independent of the total size of the network.

Accuracy: The accuracy of the above algorithm can be understood by splitting the error into two parts. The first part is the error involved in estimating the optimal service rates in (27). The second part is the error involved in estimating the global fugacities corresponding to these service rates. We characterize the first part of the error in Theorem 4, which states that the gap to the optimum utility is $O(\frac{1}{\theta})$. In other words, the local algorithm provides a good estimate of the optimal service rates when θ is large. The second part of the error is determined by the accuracy of the Bethe approximation. This error is evidenced to be reasonably small in many applications [20], [22].

Theorem 4. *Under the local utility maximization algorithm, the service rates $s(t) = [s_j(t)]_{j=1}^N$ converge to some $\underline{s} = [\underline{s}_j]_{j=1}^N \in [0,1]^{\mathcal{N}}$,* i.e., *$\lim_{t\to\infty} s(t) = \underline{s}$. Further, the limit $\underline{s}$ satisfies*

$$\sum_{j=1}^N U_j(\underline{s}_j) \geq \max_{y\in\Lambda} \sum_{j=1}^N U_j(y_j) - \frac{\sum_j \log|\mathcal{I}_j|}{\theta}. \quad (30)$$

Proof: We begin the proof by defining Bethe approximated capacity region as the set of service rates given by

$$\Lambda_B := \{y \in [0,1]^{\mathcal{N}} \mid [y_k]_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} \in \Lambda_j,\ \forall j \in \mathcal{N}\},$$

where Λ_j is the local capacity region described in (7). This definition is motivated from the concept of pseudo-marginals discussed in Section IV. Compared to a set of fully consistent marginals (*i.e.*, there is a coherent joint distribution corresponding to the marginals), the pseudo-marginals have to satisfy only a relaxed set of constraints. Hence it follows that the actual capacity region is contained in the Bethe approximated capacity region, *i.e.*, $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda_B$.

Now, we define a new optimization problem by making two changes to the original utility maximization problem (27). The first change is to relax the constraint set Λ in (27) by replacing it with Λ_B. The second change is to scale the objective function by a factor θ, and add some local entropy terms. The resulting maximization is problem given by

$$\max_{y,\{\hat{b}_j\}} \ \theta \sum_j U_j(y_j) + \sum_j H(\hat{b}_j), \quad \text{subject to} \quad (31)$$
$$\hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j) \geq 0,\ \ \forall j, \mathbf{x}_j \in \mathcal{I}_j;\ \sum_{\mathbf{x}_j\in\mathcal{I}_j} \hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j) = 1, \forall j;$$
$$y \in [0,1]^{\mathcal{N}};\ y_k = \sum_{\mathbf{x}_j : x_k = 1} \hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j),\ \ \forall j = 1\ldots N, k \in \mathcal{N}_j.$$

Here, the constraint set is specified by explicitly expanding the definition of Λ_j involved in description of Λ_B. It can be observed that for a large θ, this problem closely approximates the original problem (27) as the entropy is bounded from above and below. The advantage of defining this new optimization problem is that it is amenable to a distributed solution [7]. In particular, our local algorithm solves this problem as stated in the following Lemma.

Lemma 5. *The local utility maximization algorithm converges to a limit $\underline{s}$ such that the optimization problem* (31) *attains its maximum at $(\underline{s}, \{\underline{\hat{b}}_j\})$ for some $\{\underline{\hat{b}}_j\}$.*

Proof: The outline of the proof is to show that the local utility maximization algorithm corresponds to the dual subgradient method [28] for (31). The proof is provided in Appendix X-E. ∎

Consider $(\underline{s}, \{\underline{\hat{b}}_j\})$, the solution to the maximization problem (31). We now complete the proof of Theorem 4 by showing that $\underline{s}$ satisfies (30).

From the definition of Λ_B, for every $y \in \Lambda_B$ there exists some $\{\hat{b}_j\}$ such that $(y, \{\hat{b}_j\})$ is feasible for the problem (31). Hence,

$$\theta \max_{y\in\Lambda_B} \sum_j U_j(y_j) \leq \theta \left(\max_{y\in\Lambda_B} \sum_j U_j(y_j) \right) + \sum_j H(\hat{b}_j)$$
$$\overset{(a)}{\leq} \theta \sum_j U_j(\underline{s}) + \sum_j H(\underline{\hat{b}}_j), \quad (32)$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $(\underline{s}, \{\underline{\hat{b}}_j\})$ maximizes (31). Since $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda_B$, we have

$$\max_{y\in\Lambda} \sum_j U_j(y_j) \leq \max_{y\in\Lambda_B} \sum_j U_j(y_j). \quad (33)$$

The fact that entropy $H(\hat{b}_j) \leq \log|\mathcal{I}_j|$, along with (32), (33) completes the proof of Theorem 4.

∎

We conclude this section by comparing our utility maximization algorithm with prior works. Our algorithm is similar in spirit to the subgradient descent based algorithm (on a modified maximization problem) proposed in [7]. However, the key difference is in the complexity involved in computing the subgradients. Specifically, in our algorithm, the complexity of computing the subgradient is independent of the total size of the network; On the other hand, it could be exponentially large in the network size in [7]. Another work that is close to our work is [19], where the authors propose an algorithm with polynomial rate convergence. However, the algorithm is specific to conflict graph interference model, and cannot be

directly extended to the SINR interference model considered in our work.

VIII. Numerical results

In this section, we present simulations to evaluate the performance of our algorithms. As discussed earlier, the Bethe approximation is exact if the underlying factor graph is a tree. Further, a factor graph with short cycles is the most adversarial setting for Bethe approximation [20]. Hence, it would be interesting to understand the performance of our algorithms for random network topologies with short cycles as illustrated in Figure 1.



Fig. 1. Illustration of an interference graph of a fifteen link network used for simulations. Each node represents a link in the network. An edge is present if two links are in the interference range.

Simulation setting: We generate a spatial random network by uniformly placing the transmitter nodes on a two dimensional square plane of length 8. Each transmitter is associated with a receiver at a distance of 0.5 in a random direction. The resulting interference graph for a 15 link network is plotted in Figure 1. The path loss exponent α is set to 3, the close-in radius R_I is set to 2.4, and the threshold SINR is set to 15 dB. The transmit power of the links is set to 1.

We present the simulation results for the two scenarios considered in this paper namely: A) Service requirements are given, and B) Utility maximization setting.

A. Service requirements are given

We consider symmetric service rate requirements for all the links, and execute the local Gibbsian method proposed in Section III. We use the Newton's method at each link to obtain the local fugacities. We repeat the experiment for three random network topologies of different sizes. In Figure 2, we have plotted the convergence rate to the local fugacities for the worst case link in each of the three topologies. Specifically, the norm of the gradient for the local objective function $F(r)$ in (8) is plotted for each iteration of the Newton's method. As a smaller norm indicates the closeness to the optimal solution, it can be used to understand the convergence rate. From Figure 2, it can be observed that the proposed algorithm converges almost instantaneously, typically within 4 to 5 iterations, independent of the network size. Moreover, as discussed in Section III, the complexity or information exchange involved in each iteration of the Newton's method depend only the size of the local neighborhood, and independent of the network size. Hence, the overall performance of the algorithm in terms of complexity or convergence time is very good.



Fig. 2. Convergence of the local Gibbsian method

B. Utility maximization setting

Here, we consider the case of computing the fugacities for the proportional fairness utility setting, *i.e.*, $U_i(s_i) = \log s_i$ for all the links. We update the fugacities using the local algorithm for utility maximization proposed in Section VII. In Figure 3, we plot the norm of the subgradient corresponding to the maximization problem (31), which indicates the convergence of the algorithm. The convergence is plotted for two networks of size 15 and 20. It can be observed that the algorithm converges within 200 iterations.



Fig. 3. Convergence of the local utility maximization algorithm

C. Bethe approximation error and comparison with SGD

The accuracy of our algorithms depends on the error generated due to the Bethe approximation. We define the approximation error $e(s^t)$, as the maximum deviation from the required service rate, among the links whose service requirements are not met. In particular, for a given target service rate vector $s^t = [s_i^t]_{i=1}^N$, $e(s^t) = \max_i (s_i^t - s_i^a)$, where, $s^a = [s_i^a]_{i=1}^N$ are the service rates supported by using the approximated fugacities $\{\tilde{\lambda}\}_{i=1}^N$. We consider two random networks with sizes 15 (shown in Figure 1) and 20 links, and compare the error of our approximation with the residual error of the SGD algorithm [7] after running it for 10^9 time-slots

of the CSMA algorithm. In Figure 4, we plot the error by operating the network at different loads. We have normalized the error by dividing with the target service rate for which the network is being operated. It can be observed from Figure 4 that for practical time-scales, our algorithm results in better accuracy than the SGD. For example, at a moderate load of 0.6, the error of our local Gibbs algorithm is within 10 percent, while the error of the SGD algorithm is about 30-40 percent.



Fig. 4. Normalized error as function of the network load, after 10^9 time-slots



Fig. 5. Normalized error as a function of time at a load of 0.6

In Figure 5, we plot the normalized error as a function time, by using the time-average service rates observed from CSMA algorithm. Here, our local Gibbs algorithm computes the approximate fugacities, and uses these static fugacities (*i.e.*, they are not adapted during the algorithm) in the CSMA algorithm. The SGD algorithm starts with some initial fugacities, and adapts the fugacities by observing the corresponding service rates. The update rules used to simulate the SGD are taken from [30]. Although the SGD algorithm is provably throughput optimal, it can be observed that for practical time-scales, the residual error is rather large compared to our approximation algorithm. This is because, in the SGD based algorithm, the underlying CSMA Markov chain has to converge to a new steady state distribution for every update in the fugacities.

IX. Conclusions

We considered the adpative CSMA algorithm under the SINR interference model which is known to be throughput optimal. Under this model, we first studied the problem of computing the optimal attempt rates (fugacities) to support given service requirements. The existing stochastic gradient descent method to solve this problem suffers from impractically slow convergence. To address this issue, we proposed a distributed algorithm, namely the local Gibbsian method to efficiently estimate these fugacities. The convergence rate and the complexity of this algorithm depend only on the maximum size of local neighbourhood and are independent of the network size. We proved that our approximation corresponds exactly to performing the well known Bethe approximation to the global Gibbsian problem. We also proposed an approximation algorithm to estimate the fugacities under a utility maximization framework, and characterized its accuracy. Further, we considered two special cases of the SINR interference model, and derived closed form solutions to the fugacities. Our numerical results indicate that the proposed approximation algorithms can lead to a good degree of accuracy and improve the convergence time by a few orders of magnitude, compared to the existing stochastic gradient descent methods.

X. Appendix

A. Proof of Lemma 2

If any factor marginal $\hat{b}_j$ does not satisfy (21), then the Bethe free energy will be ∞ due to Lemma 1. Hence, such $\hat{b}_j$ cannot be optimal. Next, let us consider the Bethe optimization for the BFE defined in (15):

$$\arg\min_{\mathbf{b}_f,\mathbf{b}_v} \; F_B(\mathbf{b}_f,\mathbf{b}_v), \text{ subject to} \tag{34}$$

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}_j\setminus\{x_i\}} \hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j) = b_i(x_i), \; j\in\mathcal{N}, i\in\mathcal{N}_j, x_i\in\{0,1\}, \tag{35}$$

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}_j} \hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j) = 1, \quad j=1\dots N, \tag{36}$$

$$b_i(1)+b_i(0)=1, \quad i=1\dots N. \tag{37}$$

As all the constraints of (34) are linear, they can be eliminated by suitable variable transformation to get an equivalent unconstrained optimization problem [28].

Let us look at the optimization variables in (34). If we consider the distribution $b_i(\cdot)$, there are 2 optimization variables associated with it, namely $b_i(0)$ and $b_i(1)$. If we consider the distribution $\hat{b}_i(.)$, there is an optimization variable corresponding to each argument $\rho\in\{0,1\}^{\mathcal{N}_i}$, *i.e.*, there are $2^{|\mathcal{N}_i|}$ variables associated with it namely $\{\hat{b}_i(\rho)\}_{\rho\in\{0,1\}^{\mathcal{N}_i}}$. For convenience, we split the arguments $\rho\in\{0,1\}^{\mathcal{N}_i}$ into two sets. We use A to denote the set of arguments in which there is at most one non-zero element, *i.e.*, $A=\{\rho\in\{0,1\}^{\mathcal{N}_i} \mid \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\rho_j\le 1\}$, and use B to denote the set of all the other arguments in $\{0,1\}^{\mathcal{N}_i}$.

Variable transformation: Let us perform the following variable transformations to eliminate the constraint equations, and thereby obtain an equivalent unconstrained optimization problem:

(i) Replace the variable $b_i(1)$ by a new variable y_i. Hence, by expressing $b_i(0)=1-y_i$, we can eliminate the constraints in (37).

(ii) Let a new variable z_i (which is a vector of length $|B|$) replace the variables corresponding to the arguments in B, *i.e.*, $z_i:=(\hat{b}_i(\rho),\ \rho\in B)$.

(iii) If an argument $\rho\in A$ has the non-zero element in jth position (*i.e.*, $\rho_j=1$), then its corresponding variable

$\hat{b}_i(\rho)$ can be expressed only in terms of the vector z_i and variable y_j. This is done by eliminating (35).

(iv) The variable $\hat{b}_i(\rho)$ corresponding to $\rho = (0, 0, \ldots, 0)$ can be expressed in terms of the vector z_i and $(y_j, j \in \mathcal{N}_i)$. This can be done by eliminating (36).

By following the above steps, $\hat{b}_i$ can be expressed as a linear function of $(z_i, \{y_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i})$. Thus the free energy $F_B(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v)$ in (15) is expressed in terms of the new variables as

$$F_B\left(\{z_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}, \{y_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\right) \tag{38}$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{N} -(\ln \lambda_i) y_i - \hat{H}_i(z_i, \{y_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}) + (d_i - 1) H_i(y_i),$$

and the equivalent unconstrained optimization problem is to minimize $F_B\left(\{z_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}, \{y_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\right)$ over the new variables. Technically, there should be additional inequality constraints on these new variables to impose positivity constraints described in (12). However, it can be shown that any stationary point of the BFE given in (15) implicitly satisfies those positivity constraints [20]. Now suppose $\left(\{z_i^*\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}, \{y_i^*\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\right)$ is a stationary point of (38). Then the gradient of F_B at that stationary point should be zero. In particular, if we take the partial derivative of F_B with the elements of the vector z_i, namely $\{z_i(k)\}_{k=1}^{|B|}$, all the terms in (38) other than the term corresponding to $\hat{H}_i$ vanishes. Thus,

$$\frac{\partial F_B}{\partial z_i(k)} = \frac{\partial \hat{H}_i\left(z_i^*, \{y_j^*\}_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\right)}{\partial z_i(k)} = 0, \; k = 1 \text{ to } |B|.$$

It can be observed that the above equations asserts that the factor marginals $\hat{b}_i^*$ which are characterized by the variables $\left(z_i^*, \{y_j^*\}_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}\right)$ maximize the entropy subject to the consistency condition that its marginals are given by $\{b_j^*\}_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}$ or equivalently $\{y_j^*\}_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}$. In other words, this observation essentially states that the factor marginals $\hat{b}_i^*$ and the variable marginals $\{b_j^*\}_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}$ are related by the maximum entropy problem defined in (19).

B. Proof of Lemma 4

This proof is a continuation of the proof of Lemma 2. By interpreting the factor and variable marginals $(\mathbf{b}_f, \mathbf{b}_v)$ as linear functions of the variables $\left(\{z_i^*\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}, \{y_i^*\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\right)$, and setting the partial derivative of F_B in (15) with y_i to zero, we will get the following equation that relates the global fugacities with the factor and variable marginals:

$$\ln \lambda_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}\Big[(d_i - 1) H_i(b_i^*) - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \hat{H}_j(\hat{b}_j^*)\Big] \tag{39}$$

Observe the following from steps (ii)-(iv) of the variable transformation in the proof of Lemma 2: The distribution $\hat{b}_j$, depends on y_i, if only if the argument is either the all zero pattern, *i.e.,* $\rho = (0, 0, \ldots, 0)$ or if $\rho_i = 1$, is the only non zero element in that argument. Let us denote this argument as $\rho = (\rho_i = 1, 0, 0, \ldots, 0)$. Hence, only two terms of the entropy $\hat{H}_j(\hat{b}_j)$ depend on y_i. Using this observation in (39) gives us $\lambda_i = \left(\frac{(b_i^*(0))^{d_i-1} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \hat{b}_j^*(\rho_i=1,0,0,\ldots,0)}{\left(b_i^*(1)\right)^{d_i-1} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} \hat{b}_j^*(0,0,0,\ldots,0)}\right)$. Then we conclude the proof of Lemma 4 by applying (22) from Lemma 3 which gives us $\lambda_i = \left(\frac{b_i^*(0)}{b_i^*(1)}\right)^{d_i-1} \prod_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i} e^{v_{ji}}$.

Argument for sufficient condition: The conditions in Lemma 2 are obtained when the partial derivatives of $F_B\left(\{z_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}, \{y_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{N}}\right)$ (38) with respect to the variables $\{z_i\}$ are set to zero. Similarly, the conditions in Lemma 4 are obtained when the partial derivatives of F_B with respect to $\{y_i\}$ are set to zero. Hence, Lemmas 2 and 4 together constitute the necessary and sufficient condition for a stationary point of the BFE.

C. Proof of Theorem 2

As discussed in Section II, the global Gibbsian optimization problem (5) essentially solves a system of equations given by (4). From that analogy, it suffices to show that β_i, the solution of the local Gibbsian optimization problem (8) at a link i, satisfies the following system of equations:

$$s_j = \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i\in\mathcal{I}_i \,:\, x_j=1} \frac{1}{Z_i} \left(\prod_{k\in\mathcal{N}_i \,:\, x_k=1} e^{\beta_{ik}}\right), \;\; \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_i, \tag{40}$$

where

$$Z_i = \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i\in\mathcal{I}_i} \left(\prod_{k\in\mathcal{N}_i \,:\, x_k=1} e^{\beta_{ik}}\right). \tag{41}$$

Taking advantage of the simple structure of $\mathcal{I}_i$, the set of local feasible schedules for the conflict graph model, we derive simplified expressions for the service rates and Z_i, as given in the following Lemma.

Lemma 6. *Under a conflict graph interference model, the service rates and the local normalization constant at link i given in* (40) *and* (41) *are related to the local fugacities as follows:*

$$s_i = \frac{1}{Z_i} e^{\beta_{ii}}, \tag{42}$$
$$s_j = \frac{1}{Z_i} e^{\beta_{ij}} \prod_{k\in\mathcal{N}_i\setminus\{i,j\}} (1 + e^{\beta_{ik}}), \quad j \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{i\}, \tag{43}$$
$$Z_i = e^{\beta_{ii}} + \prod_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i\setminus\{i\}} (1 + e^{\beta_{ij}}). \tag{44}$$

Proof: The proof follows from two observations regarding the structure of $\mathcal{I}_i$ in the conflict graph model:

(i) There is only one local feasible schedule in which link i is active. Moreover, in that feasible schedule, link i is the only active link and all the neighbours are inactive.

(ii) From the definition of the local feasibility at link i given in Section III, any local schedule in which link i is inactive is feasible.

The service rate s_i stated in (42) follows by using the observation (i) in (40). Similarly (43) and (44) can be obtained by appropriate re-arrangement of terms in (40) and (41) after using the above observations. ■

Now, we have to prove that the local fugacities stated in (25) satisfy the set of equations (42), (43) given in Lemma 6.

By using (25), the normalization constant (44) can be written as

$$Z_i = (1-s_i)^{(d_i-2)} \left(\prod_{k \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{i\}} (1-s_i-s_k)^{-1} \right). \quad (45)$$

Then using (45), it is easy to observe that the local fugacities (25) satisfy (42). Similarly it can also be shown that the local fugacities satisfy (43) which in turn completes the proof of this theorem.

D. Proof of Theorem 3

The outline of the proof is similar to the proof of the conflict graph model. First, we derive closed form expressions for the normalization constant Z_i and the service rates in terms of the local fugacities (See Lemma 7). Then, we verify that the local fugacities stated in this theorem are consistent with those derived expressions.

Lemma 7. *Under the conservative SINR model, the service rates and the local normalization constant at link i given in* (40) *and* (41) *are related to the local fugacities as follows:*

$$s_i = \frac{1}{Z_i} e^{\beta_{ii}} \prod_{k \in \mathcal{N}_i^A} (1+e^{\beta_{ik}}), \quad (46)$$

$$s_j = \frac{1}{Z_i} e^{\beta_{ij}} \prod_{k \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{i,j\}} (1+e^{\beta_{ik}}), \qquad j \in \mathcal{N}_i^B, \quad (47)$$

$$s_j = e^{\beta_{ij}} \left(1+e^{\beta_{ij}}\right)^{-1}, \qquad j \in \mathcal{N}_i^A, \quad (48)$$

$$Z_i = e^{\beta_{ii}} \prod_{k \in \mathcal{N}_i^A} (1+e^{\beta_{ik}}) + \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{i\}} (1+e^{\beta_{ij}}). \quad (49)$$

Proof: If we look at the structure of the feasible schedules, link i can be active in all the local schedules in which only the links with in $\mathcal{N}_i^A$ are active. The second observation made in the proof of Lemma 6 is valid even for this model. The proof of this lemma follows by using these observations in (40) and (41). ∎

By using (26), Z_i in (49) can be written in terms of the service rates. Using that expression of Z_i along with (26), it can be verified that the system of equations in (46) - (48) are consistent.

E. Proof of Lemma 5

The partial Lagrangian of (31) is given by

$$L(y, \{\hat{b}_j\}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$$

$$= \theta \sum_j U_j(y_j) + \sum_j H(\hat{b}_j) + \sum_{jk} \beta_{jk} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_j : x_k = 1} \hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j) - y_k \right)$$

Here $\boldsymbol{\beta} := \{\beta_{jk}\}$ is a short hand notation for the dual variables $\{\beta_{jk}, j = 1 \dots N, k \in \mathcal{N}_j\}$. These dual variables have an interpretation of local fugacities. Hence we abuse the notation by using the same notation for both of them. The dual function is given by $D(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sup L(y, \{\hat{b}_j\}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ over $y \in [0,1]^{\mathcal{N}}$ and the distributions $\{\hat{b}_j\}$. We require the following result (Lemma 8) for proving Lemma 5.

Lemma 8. *The primal and dual solutions of the optimization problem* (31) *satisfy strong duality. Further, the primal and dual variables are related as follows. For a given dual value $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \{\beta_{jk}\}$, the Lagrangian $L(y, \{\hat{b}_j\}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ attains its supremum at primal values given by*

$$y_j(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \arg \max_{q \in [0,1]} \theta U_j(q) - q \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} \beta_{kj}(t), \ \forall j, \quad (50)$$

$$\hat{b}_j(\boldsymbol{x}_j; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = Z_j^{-1} \exp\Big(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} x_k \beta_{jk}(t) \Big), \forall \mathbf{x}_j \in \mathcal{I}_j, j \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (51)$$

Proof: The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 18 in [30] and is omitted. ∎

This relation between the primal and dual variables given in Lemma 8 can be used to obtain the subgradient of the dual function. In fact the subgradient for a given dual variable is equal to the residual error in the corresponding primal constraints (See [28] for details). Specifically, the subgradient at $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ denoted by $g(\boldsymbol{\beta}) := \{g_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\beta})\}$ is given by

$$g_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \Big(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_j : x_k = 1} \hat{b}_j(\mathbf{x}_j; \boldsymbol{\beta}) \Big) - y_k(\boldsymbol{\beta}).$$

Hence the update rule (29) essentially corresponds to a dual subgradient method for (31). This completes the proof of Lemma 5.

REFERENCES

[1] P. S. Swamy, R. K. Ganti, and K. Jagannathan, "Adaptive CSMA under the SINR model: Fast convergence through local Gibbs otpimization," in *Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), 2015 53rd Annual Allerton Conference on*. IEEE, 2015.

[2] L. Tassiulas and A. Ephremides, "Stability properties of constrained queueing systems and scheduling policies for maximum throughput in multihop radio networks," *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 37, no. 12, pp. 1936–1948, 1992.

[3] ——, "Dynamic server allocation to parallel queues with randomly varying connectivity," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 466–478, 1993.

[4] P. Chaporkar, K. Kar, X. Luo, and S. Sarkar, "Throughput and fairness guarantees through maximal scheduling in wireless networks," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 2, p. 572, 2008.

[5] A. Dimakis and J. Walrand, "Sufficient conditions for stability of longest-queue-first scheduling: Second-order properties using fluid limits," *Advances in Applied Probability*, pp. 505–521, 2006.

[6] X. Wu, R. Srikant, and J. Perkins, "Queue-length stability of maximal greedy schedules in wireless networks," in *Proceedings of Information Theory and Applications Inaugural Workshop*, 2006, pp. 6–10.

[7] L. Jiang and J. Walrand, "A distributed CSMA algorithm for throughput and utility maximization in wireless networks," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 960–972, 2010.

[8] S. Rajagopalan, D. Shah, and J. Shin, "Network adiabatic theorem: an efficient randomized protocol for contention resolution," in *ACM SIGMETRICS Performance Evaluation Review*, vol. 37, no. 1. ACM, 2009, pp. 133–144.

[9] J. Ni, B. Tan, and R. Srikant, "Q-CSMA: Queue-length-based CSMA/CA algorithms for achieving maximum throughput and low delay in wireless networks," *Networking, IEEE/ACM Transactions on*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 825–836, 2012.

[10] P. Bremaud, *Markov chains: Gibbs fields, Monte Carlo simulation, and queues*. springer, 1999, vol. 31.

[11] D. Shah, D. N. Tse, and J. N. Tsitsiklis, "Hardness of low delay network scheduling," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 57, no. 12, pp. 7810–7817, 2011.

[12] L. Jiang, M. Leconte, J. Ni, R. Srikant, and J. Walrand, "Fast mixing of parallel Glauber dynamics and low-delay CSMA scheduling," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 58, no. 10, pp. 6541–6555, 2012.

[13] D. Lee, D. Yun, J. Shin, Y. Yi, and S.-Y. Yun, "Provable per-link delay-optimal CSMA for general wireless network topology," in *INFOCOM, 2014 Proceedings IEEE*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 2535–2543.

[14] M. M. Halldorsson and T. Tonoyan, "How well can graphs represent wireless interference?" *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.1263*, 2014.

[15] D. Qian, D. Zheng, J. Zhang, and N. Shroff, "CSMA-based distributed scheduling in multi-hop MIMO networks under SINR model," in *INFOCOM, 2010 Proceedings IEEE*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 1–9.

[16] J.-G. Choi, C. Joo, J. Zhang, and N. B. Shroff, "Distributed link scheduling under SINR model in multihop wireless networks," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 1204–1217, 2014.

[17] P. S. Swamy, R. K. Ganti, and K. Jagannathan, "Spatial CSMA: A distributed scheduling algorithm for the SIR model with time-varying channels," in *Communications (NCC), 2015 Twenty First National Conference on*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1–6.

[18] C. H. Kai and S. C. Liew, "Applications of belief propagation in CSMA wireless networks," *Networking, IEEE/ACM Transactions on*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 1276–1289, 2012.

[19] S.-Y. Yun, J. Shin, and Y. Yi, "CSMA using the Bethe approximation for utility maximization," in *Information Theory Proceedings (ISIT), 2013 IEEE International Symposium on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 206–210.

[20] M. J. Wainwright and M. I. Jordan, "Graphical models, exponential families, and variational inference," *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 1, no. 1-2, pp. 1–305, 2008.

[21] J. S. Yedidia, W. T. Freeman, and Y. Weiss, "Constructing free-energy approximations and generalized belief propagation algorithms," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 2282–2312, 2005.

[22] K. P. Murphy, Y. Weiss, and M. I. Jordan, "Loopy belief propagation for approximate inference: An empirical study," in *Proceedings of the Fifteenth conference on Uncertainty in artificial intelligence*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 1999, pp. 467–475.

[23] J. Kwak, C.-H. Lee, and D. Y. Eun, "Exploiting the past to reduce delay in csma scheduling: a high-order markov chain approach," in *ACM SIGMETRICS Performance Evaluation Review*, vol. 41, no. 1. ACM, 2013, pp. 353–354.

[24] F. Baccelli and C. Singh, "Adaptive spatial Aloha, fairness and stochastic geometry," in *Modeling & Optimization in Mobile, Ad Hoc & Wireless Networks (WiOpt), 2013 11th International Symposium on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 7–14.

[25] F. Baccelli and B. Blaszczyszyn, "Stochastic geometry and wireless networks, Volume II-Applications," 2009.

[26] G. Brar, D. M. Blough, and P. Santi, "Computationally efficient scheduling with the physical interference model for throughput improvement in wireless mesh networks," in *Proceedings of the 12th annual international conference on Mobile computing and networking*. ACM, 2006, pp. 2–13.

[27] P. C. Pinto and M. Z. Win, "Communication in a Poisson field of interferers," in *Information Sciences and Systems, 2006 40th Annual Conference on*. IEEE, 2006, pp. 432–437.

[28] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2009.

[29] L. Jiang and J. Walrand, "Scheduling and congestion control for wireless and processing networks," *Synthesis Lectures on Communication Networks*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–156, 2010.

[30] L. Jiang, D. Shah, J. Shin, and J. Walrand, "Distributed random access algorithm: Scheduling and congesion control," *arXiv preprint arXiv:0907.1266*, 2009.